REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed on January 16, 2007.

By this Amendment, claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 22, and 23 are sought to be amended. These changes are made mainly to remove minor informalities and/or to more clearly recite claimed features. Accordingly, Applicant believes that these changes do not raise new issues or require a new search. Thus, entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Rejection of the Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least the following reasons.

In particular, the Examiner asserts that "determining a frame boundary for said audio information", as recited in claim 1, is not supported. More particularly, the Examiner states, at page 2 of the Office Action, that the specification only supports determining whether a storage location corresponds to a frame boundary for one of the components. In making this statement, the Examiner relies on a portion of paragraph [0037] in the Specification.

This portion of paragraph [0037] involves an audio input device (AID) 302 and states the following.

> AID 302 may also be programmed with the various frame sizes
> and frame boundaries for the components of MPM 300. As AID
> 302 stores information in FSS buffer 318, AID 302 monitors to
> detect whether the storage location corresponds to a frame
> boundary for one of the components. If the storage location does
> correspond to a frame boundary for one of the components, then
> AID 302 may pass a signal with the frame boundary to SAC 316.

The Examiner's position is unclear. For example, the Examiner does not explain why determining whether a storage location corresponds to a frame boundary doesn't also entail determining a frame boundary. As non-limiting illustrative examples, the Specification (e.g., at paragraph [0038], [0043], and at Figure 4) discloses exemplary frame durations that are the same

or integer multiples of durations that particular buffer locations may store. Thus, in these examples, determining a storage location corresponding to frame boundary also indicates an end or a beginning of a frame. Moreover, the Specification at paragraph [0043] discloses a scheduler and access controller (SAC) 316 updating an index for pointing to buffer locations.

For at least the above reasons, the Specification, does not fail to enable the determination of a frame boundary. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-18, 20-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite. Applicant traverses this rejection and believes that the rejected claims, at most, include minor informalities. However, notwithstanding the merits of this rejection, claims 1, 3-6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16-18, 20, 22, and 23 have been amended to remove informalities and expedite prosecution. These changes are outlined in the following paragraphs. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the reasons provided below.

In claims 1, 3, and 4, the term "said frame boundary" has been changed to "said determined frame boundary."

In claim 5 "processing said audio information" has been changed to "processing said read frame of audio information".

The Examiner states that the phrase "processing said read frame", as recited in claim 5, is less appropriate than a suggested phrase. However, this appears to be a suggestion and not a basis for rejection. Accordingly, this phrase has not been changed.

Claim 6 has been amended to more clearly identify "said schedule". Also in claim 6, "said components" has been changed to "said plurality of components".

Further, claims 6 and 9 have been amended to more clearly recite audio information features.

In claim 11, "said frame boundary" has been changed to "said determined frame boundary".

In claim 12, "wherein each component" has been changed to "wherein each of said selected components". Also, "said audio information" has been changed to "said read frame of audio information".

Claims 13 and 16 have been amended by changing "said frame boundary" to "said determined frame boundary".

The Examiner asserts on page 5 of the Office Action, that certain phrases in claims 14-17 reciting "further result" are allegedly unclear. Applicant respectfully disagrees. These phrases clearly indicate relationships to base claim features.

Claims 18, 20-23 have also been amended in a manner similar to claims 6 and 9-12.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,463,486 to Parry et al. ("Parry"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Dependent claims 1, 6, 13, and 18 each recite features involving the determination of a frame boundary within a buffer. On page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that such features are disclosed by Parry at column 11, lines 59-64, and at column 12, lines 20-24. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

These portions of Parry merely discuss positions of a circular buffer. For instance, these portions discuss head and tail positions which merely indicate the beginning and end of a circular buffer. However, these portions of Parry do not discuss characteristics of information (e.g., frames) stored within the circular buffer. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Parry. Applicant respectfully traverses. These claims recite features similar to those recited in claims 1, 6, and 13. Therefore, for reasons analogous to those presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Further Technical Distinctions

In addition to the distinctions set forth above, further technical differences exist between Parry and the claimed invention. For example, dependent claims 5, 12, 17, and 23 recite features involving reading a frame from a buffer, processing the read frame, and writing the corresponding processed information to the buffer. Such features are not taught or suggested by Parry.

For instance, Parry discloses, at Figure 7, a writer module 122 and multiple reader modules 126. While Parry discloses that the reader modules 122 may read information from a circular buffer 124, the reader modules 122 do not process such information and write it back to the circular buffer 124.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicant believes that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. Applicant does not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of any assertions in the Office Action that have not been specifically addressed in the above remarks. Thus, Applicant hereby reserves the right to make additional arguments regarding any such assertions.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present patent application.

Respectfully submitted,
LING CHEN
By their Representatives,
Customer Number: 57035
724-933-5529

Date May 7, 2007   By ___/John A. Harroun/_____
                                  John A. Harroun
                                  Reg. No. 46,339